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# Introduction

The following analysis has been undertaken by the IFRC Secretariat Water and Sanitation team based in Geneva in June through August 2014 based on data supplied by National Societies since 2005 and up to March 2014. Our sincere thanks to all who have contributed at all levels.

# Summary Information

**476 GWSI projects have been mapped, that is projects that are recovery or developmental in nature and that meet some or all of the GWSI criteria.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **People Served (2005 to March 2014)** |  |
| **Water** | **9,060,091**  |
| **Sanitation** | **4,461,217**  |
| **Hygiene Promotion** | **6,346,441**  |

It is appreciated that a number of those served with a water intervention will be the same as those served by a sanitation intervention, and therefore analysis of the cumulative maximum population served for either water or sanitation indicates that **13,400,000 have been served with a water and/or sanitation intervention.** This of course underlines our capacity to reach the 15 million target by December 2015.

# Size and Duration of GWSI Projects:

Using the maximum of the water or sanitation served values it is possible to show that for all 476 projects mapped **the average beneficiary population served per project was 28,155**. This is encouraging and shows that GSWI guidance for achieving value for money by having larger projects (creating proportionally lower overhead costs) is being followed. We encourage this trend to continue.

The **average duration of a GWSI Project was 3.3 years.** Donors and other WASH actors are increasingly advocating for or indeed insisting that 4 to 5 years is a good minimum time period in most contexts.

The following pie chart indicates the size of projects by people served:

This still indicates a large proportion of small scale projects. However, it should be noted that in small island states, or among pastoralist communities and other contexts, smaller projects are perfectly justified.

# Summary Information by Zone

Of the 476 GWSI projects mapped the following table and chart indicate the number of projects by Zone:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Projects by Zone** |
| Africa | 201 |
| Americas | 64 |
| Asia Pacific | 207 |
| MENA | 4 |
| **Grand Total** | **476** |

The information is presented again in terms of population served:

#

As can be seen from the above although Africa Zone and Asia Pacific undertake a similar number of Water and Sanitation projects the size of the projects in Africa Zone is generally larger by population size.

# Multilateral or Bilateral Projects

The following presents the number of projects considering Multilateral (IFRC) or Bilateral (including no partner projects where the host national society does not work with a partner national society):

The same is presented again considering population served (based on the maximum of the water or sanitation population served value):

The average multilateral project has 37,656 beneficiaries served, whereas, the average bilateral project size has 26,264 beneficiaries served. This suggests that multilateral projects may offer better cost-effectiveness (assuming larger projects have lower proportional overhead costs). In any case, larger projects regardless if multilateral or bilateral are still assumed to be the best utilization of funding.

# Issues with Data

Out of 476 projects mapped 220 of these projects (46%) reported the same population served figures as population targeted for one or more intervention type. This raises concerns regarding how beneficiaries served are being recorded and brings into question the accuracy of the data used for the analysis. It would be common sense to assume that people reached at the end of a project is very likely to be more or less than the targeted population at the project outset.

The mapping undertaken in 2014 recorded 476 compared with 303 projects mapped in 2012, the reason this was due primarily to improved reporting of past and present projects (thanks to all participants) rather than a large increase in the number of new projects in the last 2 years. This raises some concerns regarding the comprehensive nature of the mapping, nevertheless, it is the best we have at this time and underlines in very strong terms our reach and scale of programming.

**Sustainability and Impact:**

This data provides an overview only of the scope and scale of GWSI programming. Evidence based measurement of sustainability and impact is still for many projects required, and to that end we have encouraged post-project evaluations or reviews (such as the ‘look back’ study) more of which are being undertaken. This to ensure the quality of our programming and provide the basis for lessons to be learned in on-going or future programming - and as a marketing tool to prospective donors and partners.

A note on WatSan infrastructure sustainability – we are using the target of 70% sustainability after a minimum of five to ten years (interesting to note that DfiD is using a similar benchmark) as a measure of success. This target however may only realistically apply to the rural context where we normally have large numbers of small scale interventions – the same may not apply to urban contexts.

Software sustainability, in short behavioural change and CBM capacity over time is of course harder to capture but we have seen a significant move forward in this field in the standard approach to the ‘look-back’ study. A standard toolkit and guidance is available for this.

Our thanks to David Dalgado of British Red Cross for his assistance in compiling this data.